

Appln. No.: 10/696,867
Amendment dated November 30, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 31, 2007

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheets include changes to Figures 3, 9, 11, 13, and 14. The attached drawing sheets replace the original sheets including those figures. In the following Figures, the following reference characters have been removed: Figure 3: 310, and 314; Figure 9: 906; Figure 11: 1106; Figure 13: 1302, 1304, 1306, and 1318; and Figure 14: 1402, 1404, and 1406.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action mailed August 31, 2007, has been carefully reviewed, and these remarks are responsive to that office action. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel (“Ezekiel”; U.S. 5,625,783) in view of “Using adapters to reduce interaction complexity in reusable component-based software development” (“Rine”, 1999).

Claims 2-5 and 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel and Rine as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of “Defining menus and toolbars in XML” (“Gehrman”, Aug 2, 2002).

Claims 6, 7, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel and Rine as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of “Microsoft Office 2000/Visual Basic: Programmer’s Guide” (“Shank”, April, 1999).

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel in view of “Using adapters to reduce interaction complexity in reusable component-based software development” (“Rine”, 1999) and “Microsoft Office 2000/Visual Basic: Programmer’s Guide” (“Shank”, April, 1999).

Claims 16-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel, Rine, and Shank as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of “Defining menus and toolbars in XML” (“Gehrman”, Aug 2, 2002).

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel in view of Rine and Shank.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel, Rine, and Shank as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Gehrman.

Claims 1-23 remain in this application. Claims 24-25 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Ezekiel and Rine do not support a proper prima facie case of obviousness of claim 1 because these references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest that

"the shell adapter interface maps functions of the first plug-in and functions of the second plug-in to functions of the shell."

Ezekiel discloses an application program made up of a number of components, each associated with a set of commands. While the program is executing, a current operating mode of the program is selected. A dynamic menu is automatically constructed for the selected operating mode by determining which of the program's components are active in the current operating mode, merging the commands sets of these active components to form an active set of command for the current operating mode, and organizing the commands of the active set into a menu structure. Page 4 of the office action states that Ezekiel does not disclose that "the link is a shell adapter interface, in order to utilize the second set of interface elements and the third set of interfae elements."

Page 5 of the office action cites Rine as containing such a teaching. Rine discloses component interaction adapters that are used to encapsulate, interconnect, and manage multi-use component interactions. Applicant respectfully submits that Rine, either alone or in combination with Ezekiel, does not disclose teach or suggest that "the shell adapter interface maps functions of the first plug-in and functions of the second plug-in to functions of the shell."

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-14 properly depend upon claim 1 and are, therefore, also in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 contains a limitation that is analogous to the limitation of claim 1 discussed above. As such, claim 15 is in condition for allowance for at least reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1.

Claim 16-23 properly depend upon claim 15 and are, therefore, also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: November 30, 2007

By: /William J. Klein/
William J. Klein
Registration No. 43,719

10 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 463-5000
Fax: (312) 463-5001

WJK/ab